

Welcome to Turning Conscience Into Action, the Earth Charter podcast. Join Mirian Vilela, Earth Charter International Executive Director, in her fascinating conversations with great thinkers, scholars and activists from around the world who are working in the fields of sustainability, ethics, education and social transformation. Our purpose is to generate new insights on how to face current global challenges and inspire informed action.

Hello everyone, thank you for joining us. Today we have a special guest, Kathryn Gwiazdon.

Kathryn is Executive Director of the Center for Environmental Ethics and Law. She is also Chair of the Ethics Specialist Group of the IOCN World Commission on Environmental Law and Professor of Climate Law and Policy and International Law at the Northern Illinois University College of Law. Kathy, thank you so much for joining us today. It's a real pleasure to be here, thank you. Now you have written, you have worked in that intersection of climate ethics, international law, environmental governance for many years, but lately you have been part of a big project.

You have co-edited a book with Donald Brown or Don Brown and Laura Wester, which is called the Rootlet Handbook of Applied Climate Ethics. So would like to hear from you if you may, if you give us the gist, the purpose of this book and what are the key ideas we can find in it. Of course, and to just take a step back, I mean one of the editors, Donald Brown, who is instrumental with the creation of the Earth Charter, who I met through Ron Angle, who was also a drafter of the Earth Charter. So the worldview that they share, the principles that guide them are what guide me and what guided this publication.

One of those foundational principles being that ethics is action, period. Ethics is in ethical principles underlight every decision that is made, which is also why we cannot separate decisions related to climate change or climate change harms from the principles that are advanced by those decision makers, whether it's budgets, whether money is put into or not into climate change solutions, whether it's active disinformation, where money is put into attacking the science of climate change. All of these actions have underlying ethical principles.

And so that's really the premise of all of the entire book, really. So you started by clarifying that ethics is action. It's not something that's sitting there on a theoretical conversation in book, in discussions and books. So does that really can be seen, permeated throughout this, the work you have been doing, but also this book that is very timely on applied climate ethics. Is that right? Yes. So I come from a practitioner background, but I also teach. So I'm able to make that bridge between practice and academia and scholarship, although I see just as much scholarship and wisdom and practice is on the ground action.

In fact, what we aim to do is raise in part the evidentiary value of the lived experience to take knowledge out of the ivory towers and say, here are the communities that are being harmed by climate change harms or sometimes climate change solutions. So when we were drafting the book and having all of this as its underlying purpose, we also explicitly looked for authors that were not just the academic experts, which have incredibly important

voices, but the practitioners, like yourself, like the Earth Charter having its own chapter in this book as well.

So that was integral to our approach, also the diversity of authors to have not just those from practice and from academia, but in those that bridge the two, but also from different parts of the world, right, so that we can get the issues that they care about. And the way that it was structured, because again, ethics is action and ethics is the inquiry into right and wrong behavior and when responsibility attaches, key responsibility. We need to look at what different states are doing and how communities are responding, right?

So that was the core to all of it. In our process and in the substance of the book as well, how to counter the arguments that states and policymakers are making to either not act on climate or not act sufficiently on climate or directly attack climate change action. I certainly think this book is extremely valuable in clarifying all of this. You have two chapters inside that book, yourself in addition to be a co-editor. And can you share with us the key ideas that we can find in your chapters? One is related to saving democracy, denying the alternative reality of climate then nihilism, which is something that we are currently living, but also on the issue of climate change, this information.

So we would like to hear from you some of the key ideas you articulate there. Of course. So the first chapter is the climate change disinformation campaign and really that focuses on the well-funded, with intent strategy to counter climate change action and climate change law and policy. And a little bit of the history behind it, because if you can identify the actors, you can identify the why. Why are they doing this in order to kind of be able to counter what they're doing? So the disinformation campaign largely rose as a counter movement to the successes of the civil rights period in the United States, as a counter to the successes of the environmental movement in the United States.

They saw all of these goods happening for the common good through the law, and they saw that as a threat to free market fundamentalism and neoliberal ideology. And so that chapter focuses on a lot on what's known as the Powell Memo, Memo that came in the early 1970s, that was sent by a lawyer to the Department of Commerce that said that these movements counter or these movements threaten moneyed interests, corporate power and corporate consolidation of power. And there's also racial undertones as well.

That was later brought to the attention of President Reagan of Margaret Thatcher, who of course advanced neoliberal ideology. And then he was awarded with a seat on the Supreme Court as well. But within that memo, explicit guidance on how to counter the common good, or the idea that the government is for the public, for the common good. So that's why you later heard Reagan and Thatcher saying that the government is the enemy, that they're not the ones that we should be, the threats of a large government, right?

That's about the time we heard this. And so they wanted to go into media. They wanted to go into universities. And this is all listed in the Powell Memo specifically. And then you see the direct connections with dark money, with who's funding it. And so this all kind of raises this up and ties it directly to the climate change disinformation campaign because it's all directly linked even back to the 1970s. But what's sad to me is that they

saw the good that came from the U.S. recognition of civil and political rights, of human rights, of environmental protection.

And they saw that as a threat to private moneyed interests. And then it led to things like Citizens United, which allowed in the United States, it was a court case that said that corporate money was free speech. And so then it's only gotten worse, right? So the climate change treaty, climate change law has the most robust science than I would say any other law in the books, any other treaty on the books. And so that is why the science is being directly targeted. Yeah. And we know that maybe this misinformation or disinformation, lack of information around climate change is intentional in many ways.

Of course. This is in context, but it's also generating a bad impact. Yes. So it's good to be vigilant and to understand what's going on and try to see things from different lenses. So we open up the boxes of disinformation around climate change. Exactly. And we also look at the language they're using. So they'll try to take language from democracy. Like this is an attack on liberty. This is an attack on freedom and say, freedom cannot exist without the common good. Liberty cannot exist without truth.

And so if they're saying that the climate science is wrong, which it's not, then how would, so it's using the words of democracy. So they're in a way acknowledging the importance of democratic principles, right? But they're using that and manipulating it in a way to center again on the self, right? To say this is a threat to your money. Like this is also what guided the deregulation campaign. To say that's an attack on freedom. When really what is regulation? It's for public health. It's for common good.

It's for clean air, clean water. So it's really this individualism versus common good that we're seeing and how to counter it. Our premise is identify it. Identify it first and foremost. And that's kind of what the second chapter goes into, the saving democracy part. And you would really love that chapter if you haven't read it yet. Because it centers about how since this is an anti-intellectual campaign, the core to it is education. And what they're doing really is fighting education. They're fighting an educated populace.

And I cite Thomas Jefferson in there too. And the best way to fight against a counter tyranny, to counter unequal power and interests is through education. And so when you start advancing an anti-intellectualism in law and policy where you don't follow the science, you don't follow the data, then you are not creating a democratic governance. There's a really good quote in there too by Arun Dharati Roy about how funding and money to interests has hurt solidarity more than any repression ever could.

Because if you keep going back to why these actors are advancing these lies, that's what it is, it all goes back to self and self greed and profit, which is not for a just sustainable future. Absolutely. And I'm glad you mentioned the importance of really looking at the role of education here. And as I mentioned in the chapter that I myself contributed to that book, emphasizes the importance of ecological and ethical literacy. That really is something that we should look at the number of world leaders that lack that kind of literacy that are actually illiterate, ecologically and ethically illiterate leaders making a lot of decisions that are generating huge impact.

So even within our Commission on Environmental Law for IUCN, there's an entire work product or project on educating judges. Just to educate judges on the science and the language and the arguments and the defenses and the connections to rights and responsibilities. And once that happens, once that there's two things that changes judges, decisions, actual decisions is education and also experience. So what courts are also doing is taking judges to the places where people are harmed, to bear witness, which is one of the principles of our ethics work, to bear witness to the harms.

And those two things have done nothing, have done only good for creating more just decisions by courts. Now, this education program for judges is led by IUCN. Is that right? Yes, the World Commission on Environmental Law. IUCN, Commission on Environmental Law. Yes, yes, yeah. Wonderful, outstanding. Now, so the handbook of applied climate change ethics is really very valuable. And I want to congratulate you as well as Don Brown and Laura Westra for working on this huge project that brought together voices of individuals working on this topic from various contexts, very valuable.

Now, very 2025, COP30, COP30 is around the corner, is around climate change, but it's the first time in history, as far as I understand that COP on climate change is giving so much space and visibility to the topic of ethics. So a few months ago. I think you're right. I think this is the first. I mean, Don and I would often have sessions at different Cops, but this is the first where you see it really as part of the leadership approach of the entire platform. So. Absolutely. So part of the, it's a central part of COP30 is to address the ethical dimensions of climate change.

So we know Don Brown and you have been part of Cops, have had side events and discussions on it. And Don Brown has a whole book about the ethics and ethical dimension of climate change. This particular historical moment that we are living is that the COP Presidency themselves are calling for a global ethical stock take to address climate action. So we would like to hear your thoughts on this idea and what's going on and what would be the ideal outcome of this important opportunity to position ethics within the discourse of climate change.

Well, my first reaction was, wow, this is happening. This is a good. But I also look specifically when actors talk about ethics, who the actors are, right? Because ethics can often be used as a tool to manipulate, right? To advance interests that aren't for just sustainable futures, etc. But looking at the actors leading it as well, wow, right? Those are my reactions. So I think that it's amazing that it's coming from Brazil. It's not a surprise it's coming from Brazil because quite a bit of our ethics community work was housed and based and rooted in Brazil.

So it's very much part of the spirit and soul and culture of the people. One of our guiding principles is *conciencição*. *Conciencição*. I always mistake that. Again, a core principle to our work. And as far as the methodology to have those regional meetings, and I know that some have already happened, and then I looked at the leaders of those regional meetings. There's one coming up with Karina Gore in the center of ethics in New York. So again, Mary Evelyn Tucker had also led one. So the people, and there was a, I think, Matai was also in there as well.

So amazing people. It's for Africa, no? Yes. There are regional leaders for the global ethical stock-take dialogue. One is Juan Jira Matai, the daughter of Juan Gary Matai for Africa. Yes. And Mary Robinson for Europe and Karina Gore for North America among others. Okay. It is Mary Robinson. Maybe that's who I'd seen that Mary Evelyn. But amazing people involved. So that'd be the second thing I look at. It's not just the actors creating it, but a big part of ethics is not just to say what the principles are.

It's the process itself. And this is an incredibly robust process. And if it has a robust process grounded in the very principles it seeks to advance, then the outcome is something that we should all pay attention to. Now I also think that this is incredibly needed right now because I feel after the COP and the UAE that they took a legitimacy hit, the climate change convention as a whole. Starting from Glasgow, you had more corporate actors involved in civil society. So you're starting to see a turn where the voice of civil society is becoming more and more downplayed or even a lack of space provided to them.

And then when the COP was in the UAE, you had the oil industry that was literally the president of the COP itself. So there were stories and this is all anecdote of the movement being mocked, of climate change being mocked. You had interesting stories of conflicts of interest. So I think that there, whether it's the appearance of impropriety, I think there was a legitimacy hit to the convention that happened in the UAE. And I feel like part of what is going to happen in Brazil and Belém is a revival of the ground roots community together with the state, with the government entities, which exist for the common good coming together.

And the particular forefront of indigenous peoples, the particular forefront of ethics, I'm really, really excited in looking forward to this. And international law needs it. We need it good because international law as a whole is under attack everywhere. So it would be good to see this positive. Do you are a professor, you are in the university and you're also part of many networks. Have you thought of engaging your students themselves in organizing some of the discussions into a self-organized dialogue for the, as a contribution for the global ethical stock take?

Yes, I actually have. Leading it through the ethics specialist group of the Commission on Environmental Law, since it's like an explicit, I mean, my organization is the Center for Environmental Ethics of Law, so it could do NGO, but it could also do IUCN. So it's already at the level of the international organization. And then part of our approach is bringing in young voices, youth voices. So absolutely. This is part and parcel. I already have the forms all downloaded to make it part of our course, our course this semester.

I feel like it's part of my responsibility of chairing an ethics specialist group of a conservation union as well. So absolutely. I see this really as an opportunity, not only to contribute to the international intergovernmental process with the voice of people from different places, but also as a way to spark and generate change and ripple effect within different local contexts, just by establishing a process to engage students or young people or academics into thinking about their role. Also in addressing sometimes the ethical dilemmas, what are the values that we need to really move towards implementation in higher levels of climate change.

Well, that's my luck about this. I mean, here we have a very concrete treaty, multilateral treaty, the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, all of its protocols. I mean, it's this concrete. This is law. It has teeth, right? And then for them to put ethics at the forefront, where ethics sometimes people see as this abstract wishy-washy thing, and they don't even know really what it is. I mean, this also gives a huge platform to show the potential of ethical voices, ethical arguments to guide or that have guided already the convention, which they have.

Precautionary principle is in there. Duty not to harm is in there. So this gives a great platform for ethics and for climate and for realizing the power and potential of both together, right?

Katie, what do you think would be the ideal outcome of all of these efforts? Oh, my goodness. Oh, my goodness. That's I don't even I don't even know because there's so many times that there's they have these big cops that can make conferences, the parties, and they make these statements and then they don't amount to anything.

And the data has shown the trajectories have shown that we're still hitting tipping points. We're going towards tipping points that this isn't reversing the numbers, right? So is this methodology up to maybe Bellum is offering a new methodology rooted in ethics? I don't know because what's happened till now by data has shown is not working. Something is not working, whether it's a negotiation structure or some countries have more power than 100 countries. Whether it's the the non binding commitment, non binding commitments, you know, that they make where they'll say these things and then the very next day sign a male, a major oil and gas development project or something.

That's happened at so many, excuse me, so many of these big conferences that I've been a part of where you hear the words of these political leaders and then the very next day when the concrete action happens, it's the exact opposite of what was said. So maybe that's part of Bellum as well is and again, there was a huge legitimacy hit with UAE. People are feeling down with climate change law on the international level. Domestically and states are doing quite a bit. There's quite a few leaders. But as far as the framework convention, which we need to hold strong because it can help serve as a guide to states, it's had a lot of hits to its integrity and questions of its integrity.

So maybe that's another reason why they put ethics at the front, you know, so to acknowledge that to acknowledge that there's kind of a gap between words and action that's happening with this document. Yeah. Now, 2025 also represents the 10th anniversary of Paris Agreement, but also 25 years since the launch of the Earthshatter. And we are in the midst of many other instruments, certain time for the SDGs, but also major setbacks with regards to global collaboration and even a mindset of Earth ethics and global citizenship.

So for the past 30 years, even since the beginning of the Earthshatter process, the whole Earthshatter movement has all has been about emphasizing the importance of Earth ethics of global citizenship and of understanding our relationship with the large living world in our role as part of this Earth community, you know, the languages we find in the

Earthshatter, such as community of life. So what are your thoughts on the relevance or even the added value of the Earthshatter now, 25 years since its launch?

Well, I still think that it lives up to the times of today. So we just have to make sure that it's directly speaking to the times of today, to the what we call in the states in the political world, the kitchen table issues, the issues that most affect families and communities, the things that they care about and that they worry about. I've noticed in practice that at times when international law, international governance is threatened or weakened or questions of integrity or capability.

And this is also the model we use for our community work, that it all comes back down to local community action, local community stories, even if they don't know what's happening on the international realm or how their story matters to connections that Mosaic, like you talked about, of the universal, what they do in their personal lives is enough and it can be enough.

And part of our work is making sure that those people who are targeted, who are harmed, whose hopes don't match the reality of the government upon them and the actions being taken that do harm them, that they know they're not alone. So for me, that's the solidarity that is the strength. That's the solidarity that's true and authentic and real and it's Mary down the road in Cassandra and Gary, it's Mayada and Jordan. It's all of those specific stories that come together in the Mosaic of the universality.

That is the strength of the Earth Charter. And I think sometimes when there are larger threats, whether it be a degradation of international rule of law or war or conflict, that we always have to go back to those simple truths of caring for one another, which is at the heart, at the core of the Earth Charter. And for me, my favorite principle, because I went through and read it all again, of course, is the building of democratic societies, because that's the fairness, that's the equity, that's the justice, that's the access to courts, that's the freedom of speech and assembly.

And when I teach human rights law, I talk about this. A state that recognizes human rights is a state that is more secure. A state that weakens attacks, represses human rights and collective rights included is a state that is less secure, less stable. So when they make national security arguments to harm people or harm nature or drill baby drill or deforest, that harms, that's a security argument, right? Of real people, real people on the ground. So democracy at the forefront is how we lead. And then another direct vehicle that I use through the Earth Charter itself is the entire pillar of ecological integrity, because we are now, I'm with Klaus Wasselman, who's also integral to the Earth Charter movement.

He, with him, they, and Ron Angle, they, and Don Brown, they brought me into this group called the Global Ecological Integrity Group. And every year, Klaus still, his paper's on Earth Charter, every year, it's a continuation, but we always change our themes with an issue of today. So after the invasion of Ukraine, we talk specifically about ecological integrity and peace, the role of ecological integrity and peace. We talk specifically during COVID, specifically about the role of ecological integrity and public health.

This meeting we just had, and this is 33 years, this meeting we just had specifically about the role of ecological integrity and emergency, whether it's conflicts, whether it's poverty, you can't eat, you can't find food, you can't find water, or whether it's natural disasters caused by climate change. So that's how we continue to put principles and even entire pillars of the Earth Charter into our work. And it's always connected to, to just real people, real people, real harms, real hopes, real values, the ethics that guide them, and asking why aren't those same ethics, what guide our laws and policies that govern us, right?

So the global ecological integrity group, so that our audience understands, it's a group that have been meeting for the past 30 years, every year. Every year. Is it a group of academics from a specific field or from law or philosophy? Well, what's really interesting, so it is specific academia, but we also, with intent, look for students as well. So it's also aimed at finding outstanding students and giving them a specific platform to, and a chance to publish. So this one is kind of narrowed to academia and it's hosted by a different university every year, but sometimes we have practitioners as well.

So what's interesting is also is that it's interdisciplinary. And this is why it's my favorite meeting every year, because you have philosophers, you have lawyers, sometimes too many lawyers. You have poets, poet activists. You have, I mean, it's, we have physicists. I mean, it's amazing. It's, but all of us are talking about ecological integrity, but with different voices. It's just, it's beautiful. It's beautiful and it's powerful. We had the honor of hosting the Global Ecological Integrity Group here in Costa Rica in 2013.

And if I'm not mistaken, also in the year 2000, when the first chart was launched, so twice, the Global Ecological Integrity Group met in Costa Rica and we had the honor of being linked to that group also for many years. Because it's a group that generates scholarly work and many publications. Also, it's important and valuable books as an outcome of these gatherings. Amazing. Yes. And they say that yours was one of the best, the Costa Rica. And they, but I missed it because I was giving birth to my daughter.

So we need another one. We need to come back. Yeah, we would be happy to welcome you. 2027, 2027, back to the Earth Charter. Now, Katie, you are a professor and have been teaching for many years. From human rights to environmental law and governance. And you have been using the Earth Charter as part of your courses, as far as I understand, and also your research. So can you share with us how do you make these connections in your actual teaching practice?

I just introduced them to the document. Lawyers are primary source actors. And so I go straight to the source. And I've done that since starting to teach. My very first time as teaching was 2010, 2010, 2011. And I literally just present them with this document. And many have said that they've not seen it before or heard about it and are amazed that it exists. And then depending on where the university is located, for example, the local chapter of the Earth Charter in Indiana is incredibly active.

And so so I just introduced them to the primary source. And again, all of the principles within are so relative to all of our work as just foundational underpinnings of law, governance, principles of justice. That's the other principle, too, on social and economic justice. That is the purview of lawyers, right? To make sure that we have a just, a

sustainable future, but a just sustainable future. So it's the natural language of lawyers and of the law. So I think that's probably the first and most powerful thing is to just introduce students that this exists and that there's people out there working on this.

And then they cite it in their papers, etc. So then they take it on to this college. Helps them in their own research and reflection about the principles of international law or international environmental law, human rights law and link it with the principles of the Earth Charter. Exactly, exactly. And I think they think that and this is also how laws taught in the US, because we're a jurist doctorate versus PhD. And so it's much more siloed. And so environmental law as a whole is very siloed. And so to have a document that talks about nature is a foundation of life, but to also connect it with social justice issues.

That's monumental. And it was one of the first to really overtly do that. So it has its own standing and a strong standing on making those connections that are not just core to my pedagogical approach with teaching, but are of core, of course, to my work with communities as well, that this is connected. And you cannot separate the harms to people from the harms to nature, the foundations of life, because the same actors, the same industries, the same systems are involved in the harms to both. You're not going to have a friendly fascist that wants to protect the Earth.

So democracy matters. Democracy matters. Yes, absolutely. Now, this year, something historical happened. We want to celebrate and give visibility to that, but also try to understand. So the International Court of Justice and the Inter-American Court of Human Rights issued historic and landmark decisions regarding state obligations in addressing climate change. Yes. So could you help our audience understand what what does it entail? What does it mean? What are these decisions and offer your reflections on their significance?

Of course. What I can say, I mean, this is a massive question with massive cases that will take my entire climate change law course next semester. But if I could say just a few things about them here, is that they said what we already knew, what many states and state courts are already deciding and advancing. But what matters here are the institutions that did it. It had to come the rulings, the statements of responsibility, of obligation, had to come from these bodies, these international bodies, because it added, again, a robustness to the entire legal movement for climate action, climate protection.

So, yes, the arguments of state responsibility, state obligation, the use of the precautionary principle, common but differentiated responsibilities. Everything is there, right? And making it clear that it's a responsibility of states, the duty not to harm and the responsibility of states to abide by these existing obligations, right? Existing obligations not only found in the Climate Change Convention, but across the board. I mean, just earlier, we also had a decision from ITLOSS, which is the Tribunal and the Law of the Sea, that said the same thing about marine pollution includes climate change, right?

So you have all of these major courts now, you have ITLOSS for Law of the Sea Tribunal, ICJ International Court of Justice, the American, the Inter-American Court of Human Rights to put it within the human rights perspective as well. This matters. So, yes, it was coming in piecemeal, right? And all of those piecemeal approaches and the lawyers

involved, because I was part of the IUCN written submission, just as an advisor, not as a key author. But all of these actors put in and in fact, the decision before the ICJ, the AO, had the most participation than any advisory opinion before them in their history, the participation of states and also non-state actors invited and otherwise.

So it was interesting. It was a topic that calls the attention of many. Exactly, that many care about because it is a global issue. So, yes, when we feel larger threats, it comes down to what we're doing in our small communities and homes, but we cannot deny the reality that there are certain crises happening globally that affect us all. So I think it was monumentally important not just to have the decision to crystallize what other courts and lawyers have been saying and from these bodies, but I feel like the process itself was also incredibly noteworthy, not just the ICJ process, the actual written statements and oral statements, but the process to get it to the ICJ.

It was led by small islands. It was led by Vanuatu. They had a campaign where they literally went to the General Assembly to try to get votes and it was youth led. So here you have people who are often said they don't have power, blah, blah, blah, they're not United States, they're not Canada, they're not Australia, as far as negotiations, you have this little Vanuatu, right? And you have youth. Even the government, right? It didn't start with the government. Exactly. But then they saw, yes, it started with students and the government had to follow along because it's like they started something, right?

They lit a fire. And so that process, the entire process of the campaign to try to bring this before the court and then the court process itself, all of those things like we just talked about with what was it? Oh, the writing of this book and the ethics of the core of the COP 30. When you have a robust process, it should naturally lead to a meaningful end. And that's what happened here, right? So I'm really excited about it. But then, of course, is the what's next. But I think the power of this is because of the power of the process, because those students, those youth leaders, all those that gave their time and energy and heart and passion aren't just going to disappear.

We're a lot of times in negotiations at the climate change cops and all these conventions and treaty bodies and dood-de-dood, the way we've been doing international law for decades now are department agents who don't have a bone in the fight, you know what I mean? Other than what their government tells them where this was led by a movement. Right. So I expect a different result to come from from this. I'm very excited about that. Absolutely. Thank you so much for sharing these insights behind the important decisions of the International Court of Justice, which we can see from what you said that, well, it's just the beginning of something bigger that's constantly evolving.

Absolutely. Maybe one last question. IUCN, so IUCN has the World Commission on Environmental Law. Yeah. IUCN adopted the Earth Charter through an IUCN resolution back in 2004. So what do you think is the role of IUCN, especially the Commission on Environmental Law in all of these processes of evolving processes of climate change law, environmental law, even looking at the roller-shadow can play? Yeah. Well, I would think first of the methodology because it already has a home and a point and a foothold within IUCN.

We've talked time and time again because we have all these past adopted resolutions and they still exist. They are never erased, never retired. They are still there. So even if it was past 20, 25, 30 years ago, a resolution is it still exists. So you can always use that point as a point to then build a process for action. So what I would recommend and within the World Commission on Environmental Law, we're in a transition right now because the Congress is happening in one month. And so that's when you have a new Commission chair, even though she's running unopposed, but they dissolve all specialist groups, they dissolve all membership and then reinstated.

So I would just offer an invitation now and welcome if the Ethics Specialist Group is reinstated, as it should be, to merely reach out to us and we can do a project together on how to bring in the Earth Charter more explicitly to revive, renew the Earth Charter commitment that was made by members through a voting process, how we can revive that back into IUCN. Hopefully in one month I'll be calling you and I'm like Ethics Specialist Group is still there. I hope IUCN will take that stand again and commitment.

And even and I will say even, you know, because as a lawyer, you always think of all possible avenues, even if for some reason the ESG isn't there, this is an adopted resolution. There are other avenues that you can take to bring attention to the fact it has or has not moved. You could go directly to Council, to intersessional Commit or intersessional councils, another Commission as well. There's an Economics Social Policy Commission, which is really cool. I like them a lot. So there's a lot of avenues, but you have the strongest thing you can have, which is an adopted motion that is now a resolution and it does not disappear with time.

OK, great. Well, good to know. So we are going to work towards reviving that. Yes, absolutely. Even that it's been 21 years since IUCN adopted the Earth Charter resolution in the Congress in Bangkok. And I'll tell you, because I do sit on the motions working group, so we're the group that reviews the motions and make sure that they pass statutory requirements and then we become the Resolutions Committee during Congress. But the Earth Charter is still cited frequently in other members' motions. So you'll see, because part of the argument for putting a motion through, you have to give a history.

You'll say, in such and such, this was adopted, this resolution, in order to support your new motion. And so Earth Charter is frequently noted in the preambulatory sections. So it's still alive, but also we need to see explicitly the work to follow. So. Amazing. Well, that's very good to be useful to know for me. So, well, Katie, we came to an end of our conversation today. I want to express my gratitude for the outstanding work you have been doing, precisely in that intersection of environmental ethics and law and bringing together different networks, not only as a global networker, as I see you are in the field of environmental law, ethics, but also as a professor and outstanding work you have been doing in bring in sensitizing your students with all of these very important issues.

So congratulations and thank you so much for joining us today, Katie. Of course. And I would just like to say that I would not be me without the Earth Charter. I would not because it's Ron Angle was my mentor. Immediately introduced me to Klaus Bosselman. Immediately to Brendan Mackey. Regina is on my board. Regina Omar, Brendan. I mean, they're all part of my heart and part of my purpose. And they would not be who they are

without the Earth Charter. So I just want to let you know as well, the foundational role that you've played in my life and worldview and passion and movement onwards, right?

Forever onwards. Thank you so much. Thank you so much, Mirian.

If you like this episode, please share it and support our movement by making a donation. This podcast is developed by Earth Charter International. As part of our work as UNESCO chair in education for sustainable development with the Earth Charter. For more information, visit our website at earthcharter.org.